

THE WARS  
OF  
QUEEN VICTORIA'S  
REIGN.

FROM 1837 TO 1887.

BY  
LEWIS APPLETON,  
SECRETARY OF THE  
BRITISH AND FOREIGN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION.

---

PRICE SIXPENCE.

---

LONDON:  
PUBLISHED BY THE  
British and Foreign Arbitration Association,  
Palace Chambers, 9, Bridge Street, Westminster, S.W.





## THE TWENTY-THREE WARS OF QUEEN VICTORIA'S REIGN.

---

---

FROM 1837 TO 1887.

---

---

THE celebration of the Jubilee of Queen Victoria's Reign, from 1837 to 1887, naturally leads the minds of her subjects to a retrospect of the great events in the history of the Nation, which have taken place since the Sceptre was placed in the hand, and the Crown was set upon the Head, on the 21st June, 1837, of the youthful Queen, and who has therefore completed the 50th year of her Reign.

From the moment of Queen Victoria's accession to the Throne until now, it may, without exaggeration be said, that the Queen has reigned in the hearts of her people; and, with here and there an exception, has fulfilled the brightest hopes of her loyal subjects of the whole Empire.

In celebrating, therefore, the year of Jubilee, it would be well to give a sketch of the Foreign Policy that has been pursued, and the Wars that have been waged during Queen Victoria's Reign.

There can be little doubt that the full importance of the great events in the history of England are not duly estimated at the moment. When the future historian of the 19th Century reviews the great events, the varied episodes of the years of Queen Victoria's Reign, he will see the great issues of the many campaigns which have marked (may I not say disgraced) her memorable Rule; campaigns in which the British Army has borne so conspicuous a part, and of campaigns in which it has been an ally of a European Power.

When the body of King William IV. lay in State, and when the accession of Queen Victoria was proclaimed on the 21st of June,

1837, with the boom of Cannon and the fluttering of Flags, almost on the anniversary of the Battle of Waterloo, England was at peace with the whole of the Nations of the World.

The whole of Europe, so long convulsed with the protracted struggles which had raged since 1793, and which had deluged the Continent with blood, was once more restored to tranquility and the priceless blessings of peace, and the Nations and peoples were rejoicing in the cessation of hostilities.

Queen Victoria, in her first Speech from the Throne, October 20, 1837, addressed to the British Parliament, rejoiced in the amicable relations between Great Britain and all Nations, and used the following words :—

“ I rejoice that, in ascending the Throne, I find the country in amity with all Foreign Powers ; and while I faithfully perform the engagements of my Crown, and carefully watch over the interests of my Subjects, it shall be the constant object of my solicitude to preserve the blessings of Peace.”

When the Queen succeeded to the Throne of England, vacated by the death of William IV., Lord Melbourne, at the head of the Liberal Party, was the first Prime Minister of the Crown, a Minister to whom the Queen was much attached, and not to be wondered at, for he was a man of kindly nature, generous to his opponents, and genial to his friends, but he was not a strong man, he was not a Statesman.

With Lord Melbourne were associated in the government of England the Liberals and Radicals of that day: Edward Grote, Edward Lytton Bulwer, Lord John Russell, Benjamin Disraeli, Charles Buller, Sir William Molesworth, J. A. Roebuck ; and among the Leaders of the Conservative party were Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, and W. E. Gladstone, and many others; and it is somewhat remarkable, of that brilliant array of political Leaders, Orators, and Statesmen, *one* only remains—William Ewart Gladstone, of whom it may be said, after his lifelong labours for Progress, Liberty and Peace :

“ Like some tall cliff that lifts its awful form,  
Swell from the vale and midway leaves the storm ;  
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread,  
Eternal sunshine settles on its head.”

## THE FIRST WAR: CANADA.

IN 1838.

The first disturbance to the quiet and good promise which heralded Queen Victoria's Reign, came from Canada.

Founded originally as a French Colony in 1608, many differences arose between the French Colonists and the English during the first century of its history, until, in 1756, it was conquered by the British troops under General Wolfe, and settled down into comparative peace.

On the division of the two Provinces, Upper Canada received English laws in full, and had the control of its own affairs, under a Governor and a House of Representatives. In Lower Canada the feudal tenure of the land, and the preservation of the French language, with other customs of their country were granted, in addition to their own Governor, Council, and Legislature. Revolutionary agents, however, were constantly at work in both Provinces stirring up disaffection.

The cause of the War in Canada arose out of the revolutionary spirit of a few demagogues taking advantage of every trifling point upon which antagonism could exist between the Colonists and the Government, stirring them up to rebellion, and that the sure and certain remedy was to break with the Government under which they lived.

One of the leading men in the movement, which afterwards became a rebellion in Lower Canada, was Louis Joseph Papineau.

This man had risen to high position by his talents and energy; he had represented Montreal in the Assembly, and afterwards was Speaker of the House. He made himself Leader of the movement against the policy of the Governor-General, the representative of the Government at Home. Lord Gosford, Governor of Lower Canada, dismissed Militia officers who took part in the movement, and amongst them Papineau, also other members of the Assembly, and resistance thereto fanned the flame of rebellion.

The Rebels fought with desperation in Lower Canada, but the rebellion soon extended to Upper Canada, whose conciliatory Governor was Francis Head; but his policy not being approved by the British Government, he was induced to resign, and rewarded with a baronetcy.

The Government resolved to suspend the Constitution for a time, and to send out a Governor-General and a High Commissioner with

*"full powers"* to deal with the rebellion, for which post Lord Durham was selected, a man of remarkable character and distinguished public service, and who went to Canada with the brightest hopes and prospects, and there is no doubt that his mission, and the policy he adopted, saved Canada, but it ruined his political reputation.

Lord Durham went to work as if he were invested with absolute authority, and his policy met with the strongest hostility at home; almost all the leading men were against him, especially Lord Brougham and Lord Lyndhurst; and Lord Melbourne's Government not being a strong one, they were obliged to remove him from his high, responsible position. But though Lord Durham's personal career was a failure, his policy for Canada was a splendid success, for it established the great principle of self-government, which was carried into practice in Canada, and has since been extended to all branches of our Colonial Empire; and this principle of self-government is that to which the Colonial Empire of England owes its strength and security to-day.

---

## THE SECOND WAR: THE AFGHAN WAR.

[1839 TO 1842.]

The rejoicings on the accession of the young Queen were still going on, when a series of events in Afghanistan excited the profoundest emotion in England, as it could not fail to exercise the most powerful influence upon her Foreign Policy.

The Government of Lord Melbourne, acting on the sinister advice of Lord Auckland, the Governor-General of India, resolved to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan, and accordingly, in September, 1837, Mr. Alexander Burnes, an Oriental Traveller, arrived in Cabul for the purpose of entering into commercial or political relations with Dost Mahommed Khan, the Ameer of Afghanistan, a man of extraordinary ability and energy. At this period a quarrel existed between the Shah of Persia and the Prince of Herat.

At this period, also, Russian officers were believed to be in Afghanistan, wishing to win the alliance of the Ameer, the precise object that Mr. Burnes was sent to promote; and seeing the Russian



intrigue going on at Cabul, Lord Auckland foolishly resolved to treat the Ameer as an enemy, and to drive him from Cabul, and for this object he entered into an alliance with Runjeet Singh, the ruler of the Punjab, and with Shah Soojah, the exiled ruler of Afghanistan, in order to secure the latter's restoration to the Afghan Throne, and to overthrow the power of Dost Mahommed Khan, the reigning Ameer.

Here then, was the fatal cause of that ill-starred war in Afghanistan ; a war that cost England and India £15,000,000, and which sacrificed 20,000 men of all arms and 60,000 camp followers ; a total of 80,000 lives, besides the Afghans who fell in the struggle of which we have no estimate.

It was on Oct. 1st., 1838, that the Governor-General of India issued his declaration of war, and that an army of nearly 20,000 fighting men, accompanied by 60,000 camp followers, 35,000 camels and pack-horses, artillery, baggage, and stores, concentrated in Scinde, at Sukkur, as their base of action, moved forward through Beloochistan and the Bolan Pass into Afghanistan.

"Success all along the line" crowned the invasion and march to Cabul. The British forces conquered Dost Mahommed Khan after an obstinate resistance, dethroned him, captured Ghuznee, Jellalabad, and made a triumphal entry into Cabul, installed Shah Soojah on the Throne, and placed Sir William McNaghten British Minister at Cabul, who really believed Shah Soojah as safe on his Throne, as Queen Victoria was safe on the Throne of England, but alas! he was cruelly deceived.

On Nov. 2, 1840, Dost Mahommed Khan, galled by his overthrow, invaded his conquered dominions, and won at Purwandurrah a decisive victory over the combined Afghan and British forces, but not wishing to reap the results of the victory, he rode up to the British lines and offered his sword to the British General as a token of submission.

The British Commander, favourably impressed by such an incident, returned him the sword, treated him with great distinction, and offered him a princely residence and income in India.

Exactly a year after this incident, an insurrection broke out in Cabul, which led to the assassination of poor Alexander Burnes and his brother officers ; and this was really the turning point of the Afghan disasters. The head of this insurrection was Akbar Khan, a son of Dost Mahommed Khan, who demanded that the British troops should quit Afghanistan, and that his father should be restored to the Throne.

Whilst these negotiations were going on, Akbar Khan made a new proposal—to keep Shah Soojah on the Throne, and make himself Grand Vizier, which was agreed to by our envoy, Sir Wm. McNaghten; an error of policy which was dearly bought, for he was basely assassinated at a Conference soon afterwards, with his body-guard and officers, and their mangled bodies exhibited in the streets of Cabul.

In such a crisis the British garrison in Cabul determined to make the best terms possible to secure their safe evacuation of the city; and to do this they were obliged to surrender their guns and war material, and treasure, and to leave a hostage in the persons of General Elphinstone, Lady Sale, and many other ladies of distinction.

The withdrawal from Cabul began in the depth of winter, and the army marched through gorges and over precipitous mountains everywhere blocked by snow and crevasses.

The retreating army numbered 4,000 men and some 12,000 camp followers besides women and children, including poor Lady McNaghten and other ladies whose husbands had perished in the recent massacres.

At every step of the road, at every cleft in the rocks, this little army was assailed by the savage Afghans, and, it may be said, all along their line of retreat was a succession of murderous conflicts.

In the terrible Koord Cabul Pass 3,000 men and women fell, slain by the Afghans or exhausted by the hardships of the retreat.

The straggling remnant of the British army entered Jugdulluk Pass, which was blocked by the fanatical enemy. All was now over! The brave army of Cabul was finally annihilated. A few only escaped; and when sixteen miles from Jellalabad, where General Sale and an army were entrenched, the number was reduced to six; and of these five were killed by hovering Afghans, and only *one man*, Dr. Brydon, reached Jellalabad to tell the mournful tale, out of a host of 16,000 who set out on its retreat.

History does not record a more awful catastrophe, or a more affecting incident, than this emaciated survivor on horseback, “wearied and worn and sad,” bearing to a beleaguered garrison the sad tidings of defeat, disaster and death to 80,000 men and women.

This disaster to the British army encouraged Akbar Khan to besiege Jellalabad, but the garrison held out fearlessly until the arrival by the Khyber Pass of General Pollock, when they attacked the Afghan forces, and completely defeated them; and Lord Ellenborough having succeeded Lord Auckland as Governor-General of India, a forward movement was made by the British forces to inflict a signal chastisement. They encountered and defeated the Afghans,



recaptured fortress after fortress, and on the 15th September, 1842, entered Cabul.

Of the British hostages left in Cabul poor Elphinstone had died, and Lady Sale and her companions had suffered terribly, having been hurried from fort to fort, dragged, according to the fortunes of war, far away into the mountains of the Indian Caucasus, and then finally ransomed and safely delivered into the English camp, "where," says one of them, "our joy was too great, too overwhelming, for tongue to utter."

On the 1st October, 1842, exactly four years from the commencement of this disastrous war, for the purpose of restoring Shah Soojah to the Throne of Afghanistan, Lord Ellenborough revoked the policy of his predecessor, Lord Auckland, by a proclamation, which declared,

"That, to force a Sovereign upon a reluctant people, would be as inconsistent with the policy, as it is with the principles, of the British Government ; therefore, the British army would be withdrawn from Afghanistan, and the Government of India would remain content with the limits Nature had assigned to its Empire."

Thus, after four years of unparalleled trial and disaster, Afghanistan was restored to the condition we found it, and Dost Mahommed Khan once more became its ruler.

Whatever may have been the causes of those disasters, it is doubtful whether the genius of a Napoleon, or the daring of a Wellington, could have won success in such an inglorious war ; for it was based on a false and fatal policy ; in the words of Lord Ellenborough, "*to force a Sovereign upon a reluctant people.*"

---

## THE THIRD WAR : CHINA .

1839.

When the Queen came to the Throne the state of our relations with China were very unsettled, in consequence of the resolute determination of the Chinese authorities to put down the importation of opium, which our merchantmen, in defiance of the Chinese law, and of all moral law, persisted in forcing into China.

The Chinese Admiral Chin, in his proclamation, in 1839, against England, declares :

“ You foreigners, giving no heed to the laws of Heaven’s dynasty, are every day rambling about. You never let us rest for a moment from your visits. We would like to ask,” says the Chinese Admiral, “ if our Chinese ships were to take a commodity prohibited in your country, and go on forcing it into consumption, if you would bear it patiently or not ? ”

This it was that led to the Opium War against China in 1838-39, a war which was the direct cause of the deplorable successive Wars against China in 1857 and 1858.

Reduced to plain words, the vicious principle England wickedly fought for in the China War was the unjust right of Great Britain to force a hateful trade upon a foreign people, in spite of the protestations of the Government and of the public voice of the Chinese Nation. A more iniquitous War cannot be imagined, for England at the onset and throughout was distinctly in the wrong, for which the East India Company were mainly responsible, and with them a few private merchants, who bought of the East India Company the noxious drug which they grew in India, and sold it to poison the Chinese.

The Chinese Government, and the whole Nation, desired to get rid of, and to put down, this infamous trade.

They considered it highly detrimental to the morals, the health, and the happiness of the people.

In dealing with China, the Government of England never seemed to have given a thought of the right or wrong of the question, for they did not consider it a matter worthy of any consideration.

The controversy was entered upon, and the War waged with a “ light heart.”

The English Government appointed officials to reside in China to control our commerce, and, unluckily, they invested themselves with a sort of political or diplomatic character ; and no sooner was opposition shewn, than these officials, acting on the conviction that the English Government were behind them, ordered Ships of War to break down the opposition at Canton, and thus to light the torch of War between England and China.

England believed that China was determined on War, which she was not ; and China believed that England, from the first, was determined on War, which was quite true.

The fact was, the English people knew little or nothing of the

merits of the quarrel ; all they imagined was, that Englishmen were in danger in a foreign country, which they were not ; that they were imprisoned, which was false ; their lives in danger, which was equally absurd ; and then, as usual, that the Flag of England was insulted, whereas it was the Flag of China that was insulted.

Moreover, it was a general but mistaken notion, that the Chinese were a barbarous people, who had no alphabet, and were conceited, and that it would be a good thing to take the conceit out of them ; and for this sentimental and absurd grievance, the War was justified.

In my opinion we ought to have had nothing to do with this iniquitous trade of opium ; and we ought to have announced from the first, and in the firmest language, that we would not protect it, and then held firmly to this righteous determination.

That course would have been worthy of England and worthy of a Christian nation ; whereas we bullied and threatened, and finally rushed into an unholy War. It was on our side an easy victory ; in fact, a succession of easy victories.

We captured the island of Chusan ; our naval squadron went up the Peiho, and burnt and bombarded in every direction, and at last threatened the Capital ; when, to avoid a general massacre negotiations were opened, and the preliminaries of a Treaty drafted ; but neither side would agree to sign, and the War was re-opened.

Ningpo fell, Amoy was captured, and Nankin besieged ; when the Chinese Government saw resistance was hopeless, and they sued for peace.

What did England get ? We asked for the island of Hong Kong, and got it. Then that the Five Ports—Canton, Amoy, Foo-Choo-Foo, Ningpo, and Shanghai—should be thrown open to British trade, and that British Consuls should reside there ; and finally, England demanded a War indemnity of four and a half millions sterling, and one and a quarter millions sterling in compensation to the British merchants ; in all, five and three-quarter millions sterling, which the Chinese were compelled to pay.

Then followed the usual flourish of trumpets, the thanks of both Houses of Parliament to the Fleet and the Army, and the promotion and decoration of the officers of the Army and Fleet.

---

## THE FOURTH WAR : IN SYRIA.

1840.

Her Majesty had not been three years on the Throne ere the vexed Eastern Question first began to disturb the minds of her Government and the general peace of Europe; and it arose from a declaration of independence by the Pacha of Egypt, and his refusal to pay for the future any tribute to the Porte at Constantinople.

Mehemet Ali, Pacha of Egypt, had assumed such power in Syria, that his position seemed to endanger the whole authority of the Sultan of Turkey, where, as Viceroy in the government of Egypt and Syria, he had been for some years arrogating to himself all the authority of an independent Prince.

The Sultan called upon the Great Powers to assist in a settlement of the question between Turkey and Egypt, and between himself and his Viceroy, who threatened to march on Constantinople with a large army, a proceeding which, by the existing Treaty between England, Russia, Austria and Prussia, called for their armed intervention.

In consequence of this appeal of the Sultan, the Four Great Powers, England, Austria, Prussia and Russia, signed a Convention on July 15th, 1840, with Turkey, for the pacification of the Levant.

Russia viewed the existing War as a revolt of Mehemet Ali against the authority of his Sovereign, the Sultan, and the Four Great Powers were in complete accord as to the necessity of wresting Syria from the hands of the Pacha, Mehemet Ali.

The English Admiral in the Mediterranean, having received instructions from the Government, arrived off Beyrout in September, 1840, with the combined squadron of the Turkish and Austrian Navy, and the Egyptian Commander was called upon to deliver up the town.

An amusing episode of this first summons was the reply of Suliman Pacha :—

“ Ne sachant pas lire la language Anglaise, il lui est impossible de repondre a moins que les amiraux ne vent bien lui faire traduire en Francaise, et en Turque ou en Arabe leur communication.”

[Not knowing how to read the English language it is impossible to answer, unless they would translate into French, Turkish, or Arabian their communication.]

The Pacha, refusing a peaceful solution of the matter, soon found to his cost what the communications of the Allied Fleet were, while a land force, under command of Charles Napier, confronted the army

of Ibrahim Pacha. Napier distinguished himself on sea and on shore.

The bombardment and capture of the great fortress St. Jean D'Acre followed, and soon afterwards Mehemet Ali accepted the terms of peace, by which the Turkish fleet was given back to the Sultan, Syria was evacuated by Egyptian forces, and the hereditary Government in Egypt secured.

---

## THE FIFTH WAR: IN THE PUNJAUB

1848.

The War in the Punjaub, in 1848, added another page to the sanguinary records of barbarous ambition, and reckless conquests by England, of territory in Hindostan.

The Sikhs are the bravest enemies that England ever encountered in India, for they fight with the desperation of men inspired alike by military ardour and religious fanaticism.

The War in 1848, and subsequent annexation of the Punjaub, arose from our interference in its internal affairs; and the event which precipitated the struggle was the assassination of two English officers, Vans Agnew and Anderson, at Mooltan, whilst on a mission from the Governor-General of India to Sirdar Khan, the Governor of the city.

During the time of Maharajah Runjeet-Singh, peace and friendship prevailed between the British Government in India and the Sikhs; but when he died, and his wisdom no longer guided the counsels of the State, his successor Maharajah Dhuleep-Singh, refused to recognise his allegiance to the Government at Calcutta, violated every compact his predecessor had entered into, repudiated the payment of the annual tribute, and, casting aside the peaceful traditions of his dynasty, the army of Maharajah Dhuleep-Singh, the whole of the Sikh population, joined by many of the Sirdars of the Punjaub, rose in arms, and waged a fierce and bloody War for the purpose of emancipating themselves from the British yoke.

At Mooltan, Ramnuggur, Ferozepore, Moodkee, and Chillianwallah, the Sikhs struggled with all the ancient prowess of their race, and poured out their life-blood like water in defence of their territory and independence. The great battle of Goojerat closed the greatest



struggle of the War, for there England had to cope with the most formidable foes who have ventured to withstand her in the field.

Glowing eulogies were everywhere pronounced upon the skill of British Generals, the intrepidity of Officers, and the dashing bravery of the British troops, and the immediate consequences of the brilliant series of victories was the annexation of the Punjaub to the Empire of India.

It was the triumph of brute power, and the victory must be written in letters of blood.

Stars and Garters, titles and promotions were profusely lavished, besides Peerages and Pensions for the few favoured ones. Viscount Gough, gorged with the wealth and treasure of Indian Princes, sent home £70,000 to buy an estate in Ireland, and was rewarded with an Earldom and a Marshal's baton; and what for? because a magnificent Province of India was conquered, its brave defenders put down by sanguinary violence, its soil saturated with blood, villages burnt, towns sacked, and tens of thousands slain.

Surely this conquest of the Punjaub by War could have no other result than plant the traditions of vengeance in the breasts of a brave people.

To atone for the past, may England strive in the future to consolidate her conquests in India by ruling that Empire on the only true basis which can secure its permanence—the development of her material resources, the devotion of all the energies of Government to elevate the moral and social civilization of the vast population whose destinies are committed to her hands.

---

## THE SIXTH WAR: IN BORNEO.

1849.

The originator of this War in Borneo was Mr. James Brooke, a subaltern in the East India Company.

On his return from India, in 1838, he fitted out and armed a yacht, called the "Royalist," and with a commercial cargo sailed for the Archipelago, and thence to Borneo.

On landing at Sarawak he found the Rajah of Borneo engaged in



putting down a revolt of his own subjects, and he thereupon placed his men and guns of the "Röyalist" at his disposal.

His chief exploit was to break down a stockade of bamboo and mud ; and thus Brooke and his allies won, as they considered, a great victory !

For this brilliant exploit Brooke claimed the cession of the entire province and government of Sarawak to him and his successors for ever ; and, after a little opposition, on 24th Sept., 1841, he was declared Rajah of Sarawak, amidst the roar of his own guns and the blowing of his own trumpets.

This attempt of Rajah Brooke to establish an European settlement on the coast of Borneo, was again and again disturbed by the furious onslaughts of the natives, or, as they called them, Eastern pirates, who, when successful, burnt the villages and ships in the annexed province, and captured and massacred the inhabitants.

To put down this revolt, and to support Rajah Brooke, the British Government despatched an expedition to Borneo, consisting of H.M. Vessels of War and a native flotilla under the command of Rajah Brooke.

At the mouth of the Sareba river the squadron encountered the enemy, and a terrible conflict ensued. Out of 120 Vessels of the enemy 80 were destroyed, and upwards of 1,500 men were slain ; but the English forces escaped with no loss save a few trifling casualties.

After the war, or rather, massacre, of these 1,500 men, Rajah Brooke and his allies applied to the Admiralty for the "head money," as it was then called—the price of blood which they had earned ; and blush, oh ! Christendom, for shame, £20,700 was paid them, being at the rate of £20 for each of the enemies' heads.

Mr. Cobden boldly denounced at the time this gratuitous and cold-blooded butchery, which branded its authors, he said, not only with cruelty but cowardice.

There is no doubt that this system of "head-money" for the slaughter of pirates (and all enemies of England on the seas were considered as pirates) was founded on a base and false principle, for it was a reward for homicide, it was a temptation to murder.

It was stated on good authority that it was not an *unusual* circumstance for H.M. Ships of War, when the resources of the officers and men were rather low, to project in merry mood a pirate hunting expedition, in order to replenish their exhausted purses.

Happily, the people of England forty years ago refused any longer to incur the terrible blood-guiltiness by these wanton outrages of cruelty.

They spoke out indignantly, and smote with dismay the hearts of men like Rajah Brooke, who, in the fancied security of a remote and obscure province, tarnished the honour of the British name.

With one shout down went the walls of Jericho, and this, what might be termed sanguinary law, was for ever abolished.

---

## THE SEVENTH WAR: DON PACIFICO.

1850.

In 1850 England became involved in a dispute with Greece, which was known as the "Don Pacifico."

It was in consequence of demands made by a Mr. Finlay for the price of a small piece of land, which had been taken from him by King Otho; and secondly, of a claim made by one Don Pacifico, a Portugese Jew, for losses through pillage of his house by a mob in Athens. Mr. Finlay had paid £10 for the land, and he claimed £1,500.

Don Pacifico estimated his losses at £31,534, most of which were imaginative. Neither of these gentlemen, however, had sought to establish their claim in the Courts of Greece, yet reprisals were made by the Government of England, and for a time England and Greece were at War.

On the 17th January, 1850, the British Fleet appeared in the Piræus, with a demand for the settlement by the Greek Government, within twenty-four hours, of these preposterous claims; and this demand not being complied with the Fleet blockaded the Ports, and laid an embargo, *i.e.*, seized the Government and merchant ships in the harbour.

When the absurd nature of the claims were understood, and this high-handed policy of England against a weak state like Greece known, it caused a flutter of excitement, and the man, Don Pacifico, became famous for the moment, as one whose miserable quarrel threatened an European War.

Greece appealed to Russia and France for support, and Count Nesselrode for Russia, and M. Thouvenel for France, conveyed strong remonstrances to Lord Palmerston; but they were informed that there

had been no mistake, that the affair was one which alone concerned Greece and England.

Over this trumpety dispute there was a general alarm of War; the French Government withdrew their Ambassador, but after a complicated negotiation, England gave way and agreed to an arrangement; but when the arbitration came to settle the claims of Don Pacifico, it was found he was only entitled to about 1-30th of the sum he originally claimed. He had assessed all his claims thirty times too high. He charged £150 for a bedstead worth £5; and £30 for a counterpane worth £1; £25 for a pillow-case worth 15s.; and £10 for a night-shirt worth only 10s. The jewellery of his wife and daughters he estimated at £2000, whereas he had always lived in an humble way, and was believed never to have been possessed of any jewellery whatever.

Thus for this paltry claim, Her Majesty's Navy (the most powerful in Europe) blockaded the Piræus, Greece was estranged and thrown into the arms of Russia, our friendly relations with France endangered, and, worse than all, the might of Britain used to enforce terms from a weak Power, which England would not have dared to demand from a strong Power, nor tolerated, if asked, by any Nation.

---

## THE EIGHTH WAR: KAFFIR WAR.

1846.

The absence of a pacific and conciliatory policy towards the aborigines of South Africa, led to a long series of sanguinary wars; and this system of ceaseless aggression and annexation was, in fact, an exterminating war of races, until the Kaffir race, by the mighty power of England, were swept out of existence on the South African Continent.

As a justification for these iniquitous wars against the Kaffirs, it was alleged that they were the aggressors, and the colonists the oppressed sufferers.

A more daring and impudent illustration of the wolf and lamb cannot be imagined.

In 1806, England had not an acre of land in South Africa; but

in 1846, when this cruel war began, her dominion extended over 260,000 square miles ; and to-day, by aggression and annexation, it amounts to 373,683 square miles.

When the Dutch ceded their South African Colony to Great Britain in 1806, the whole of South Africa was the property of the Kaffirs. How has it come into the possession of England? Not by purchase, for nobody ever heard of our paying for it ; not by fair and honest treaty ; not by any principle of righteous acquisition. How then? By violence, and swindling the rightful owners ; by driving them out, ruthlessly and relentlessly at the edge of the sword, from the inheritance of their fathers.

The origin of the war in 1835 arose from this lawless spirit of British aggression, and the Kaffirs were forced into resistance against these encroachments, which finally terminated in the assumption by Great Britain of the whole of the territory beyond the Fish River.

In 1811, England first waged war against the Kaffirs. We took no prisoners ; every Kaffir who was caught was killed, until the whole people were driven across the great Fish River.

In 1819, another Kaffir war, which resulted in further extension of territory.

In 1835, another Kaffir war, on the miserable pretext of cattle stealing ; and an army was organised, under the command of an English officer, which invaded the Kaffir territory, seized, burnt and slew in every direction. This was a terrible and stern revenge.

The origin of the war, under Sir Harry Smith, against the Kaffirs in 1846 was on the absurd pretext that two Kaffirs stole an axe, and when imprisoned were rescued by their own people ; and in this war England was of course victorious, and the Kaffirs were driven across the Kei river.

---

## THE NINTH WAR : KAFFIR WAR.

1850 TO 1853.

In 1850, came the bloodiest struggle in which the Cape Colony ever engaged ; it was a kind of sacred war, to which the Kaffirs were roused by the preaching of one of their prophets, and it

continued for three, if not four years, 1850-51-52-53, but at length the natives submitted to Sir George Cathcart, and Kaffaria became a British dependency.

These wars against the Kaffirs in South Africa from 1833 to 1853, must be traced to the aggressive spirit of successive Governments, their violation of good faith, the unwarrantable exactions of the colonists, encroachments upon native territory, insults upon native chiefs, and seizure of cattle and other outrages.

From 1833 to 1853 England waged three Kaffir wars, at a cost of £6,000,000, and a terrible loss of life, estimated at upwards of 80,000 of the Kaffir population.

It is a painful truth that throughout the whole of South Africa the British name is associated in the native mind with territorial aggression. War gradually advanced from the west to the east, and from the south to the north.

There is nothing black or white, African or European, in the question. Its origin is in the constitution of human nature, lust for conquest, territory, and power, and the result was wasteful expenditure of money, appalling sacrifice of life, and the shame and humiliation that must ever attach to wars of blood-guiltiness.

---

## THE TENTH WAR: IN BURMAH.

1852.

Hardly had the Kaffir War in South Africa terminated, than England became involved in a war with the Empire of Burmah.

In 1851, Lord Dalhousie, the Governor-General of India, was informed that the Burmese Governor of Rangoon had maltreated two English captains, and he immediately ordered that H.M. war ships should be sent to Rangoon to demand compensation, and, in case of refusal, to demand of the King of Burmah the dismissal of the Governor, and, if this was refused, severer measures would be taken.

The British Commodore, instead of addressing the Governor of Rangoon, sent the ultimatum direct to the King, who sent a friendly reply, in which he promised to remove the former and to make reparation.



So far, so good. The new Governor arrived at Rangoon ; and on his arrival the British Commodore sent an officer, who, finding he was asleep, got angry, and demanded that the Governor should be awoke, or worse consequences would ensue. As they could not, or dare not awake the Governor, the English officer left in a great rage, and reported to the British Commodore the great outrage to the Flag of England ; and thereupon, the Commodore summoned all British subjects to leave Rangoon, seized the Burmese vessels of war, proclaimed the Irrawaddy in a state of blockade, and broke off all further communications ; in a word—war.

This was the whole offence against Burmah, which led to a long and sanguinary war, arrested commerce, destroyed property, besieged towns, thousands slaughtered, millions spent ; and what for ?

To avenge an imaginary affront to the dignity of a sixth-rate British officer by keeping him standing in the sun a quarter of an hour.

War ! ruin ! and blood ! was nothing compared with the inexpiable atrocity of keeping a British officer standing in the sun a quarter of an hour !

To propitiate the British Commodore the King and Government of Burmah tried pacific and conciliatory messages, and offered that a British Resident should be appointed to Rangoon, and he offered also to pay a sum of 7,000 rupees as compensation.

And they went further, for finding all these efforts in vain to avert a war, they opened direct communication with Lord Dalhousie, Governor-General of India ; but, unhappily, Lord Dalhousie supported the Commodore, and sent an ultimatum to the King at Ava that he should make an abject apology to everybody, pay an indemnity of ten lacs of rupees, and a further sum in compensation for the preparations of war, and that the Governor of Rangoon should a second time be removed.

These modest proposals Burmah could not accept, and finding all attempts at conciliation were in vain, she resolved to prepare for the conflict which was inevitable.

Then followed hostilities, and the usual glorification of the “ spirit,” “ coolness,” “ intrepidity,” “ admirable behaviour ” of “ our gallant troops.”

Rangoon, Dallah, Mortaban, Kassamendive, were taken by the Fleet ; and we are treated to the usual description—that the fire was most effective, that the practice of the gunboats against the Burmese caused many casualties, that every shot told, that the enemy suffered great loss by our cannonade—one shell alone causing a



terrible explosion : and remember, the day selected for this bloody work was Easter Sunday—the day set apart to commemorate the Resurrection of the Saviour of Men.

Well may Mr. Cobden declare, as he did at the time :

“ There is neither honour nor glory to be gained when a highly civilized nation arrays its mighty power against a comparatively feeble and ignorant people.

“ The wars,” said Cobden, “ got up by a Queen’s officer, are carried on at the expense of the people of India.

“ We place an army of 20,000 men in Burmah, we seize a territory as large as England, and the proceedings attract little notice from the Press and public opinion. The reason is obvious. The bill for the cost of the Burmese War is presented not to us, but to the unhappy ryots of Hindostan. \* \* \*

“ And not merely the cost of the war, heavy as it will be, but the far more serious burden to be entailed upon India by the permanent occupation of the whole or a large part of the Burmese Empire.”

## THE ELEVENTH WAR : CRIMEAN WAR.

1854-5.

At the commencement of the year 1853 the political horizon was without a cloud, when suddenly, like “ *a bolt from the blue*,” the Eastern Question, which had long been smouldering in the East, burst, and unhappily, closed the long Reign of Peace, which for forty years had shone with conspicuous blessing upon Europe.

The Great Exhibition of the Industry of all Nations of 1851, promoted by the illustrious and lamented Prince Consort “ for the purpose of strengthening the bonds of peace and friendship amongst the nations of the earth,” and which brought into the great Metropolis of the world men of every race, and clime, and colour, it was fondly hoped would have heralded the dawn of a brighter, a better, because a more peaceful, era ; when this little cloud, like the cloud which Gehazi saw, “ no bigger than a man’s hand,” rose from the eastward, and casting its black shadow around, disturbed the calm which had so long reigned, and threatened to burst with a mighty tempest.

In this Great Eastern Question was involved the fate and fortunes of the Ottoman Empire ; that Empire which had been for centuries the terror of the East, and the perpetual nightmare of Western Europe.

The centre and source of the whole controversy out of which this Eastern complication arose, is to be found in the miserable dispute regarding the Holy Places—the Churches that have been built over those spots in Palestine where the events in our Saviour's history are supposed to have taken place—viz., the Holy Sepulchre, the Church of Bethlehem, both of which were in the possession of Turkey ; and the immediate cause of the dispute was that the Star, which had been placed from time immemorial over the altar in the Church of Bethlehem, had mysteriously disappeared.

The Latins charged the Greeks with having stolen it, and this miserable squabble was made the pretext for a diplomatic and political quarrel, and eventually became the cause of a great European War.

The French Government, to please the Catholics in France and Europe, supported the quarrel of the Latins ; not simply for the restoration of the Silver Star, but for a total change in the relations between the Greek and Latin Churches in regard to the Holy Places.

In May, 1850, the French Ambassador at Constantinople demanded of the Sultan of Turkey the possession of the Latin Sanctuaries.

The British Ambassador at Constantinople, Lord Stafford de Redcliffe, in a Despatch to Lord Palmerston, May 20, 1850, first sounds the note of alarm, by declaring that the Pope and all the Catholic Powers, Spain, Italy and Austria, support the French demand, and considered that the friends of Turkey "*cannot close their eyes to the political consequences which must follow.*"

Against this pretension Russia, as the defender of the Greek Church, *protested*, through her Ambassador at Constantinople, and justly so, in the words of Lord Clarendon, "That Her Majesty's Government were not insensible to the superior claims of Russia, both as regards the Treaty obligations of Turkey, but the loss of moral influence that Russia would sustain if she were to yield any *privileges* which the Greek Church had hitherto enjoyed, to the Latin Churches, for which France claimed to be the Protector."

In this trying position, Turkey, anxious to please *both sides*, made concessions to each, but these concessions pleased *neither*, and France threatened physical force, whilst Russia threatened to withdraw her Ambassador ; and as a *derniere ressort* Turkey, to avoid a rupture,

agreed to a mixed Commission consisting of (1) Turkey, (1) Greece, and (2) France, and it is no wonder that, so constituted, France was bound to win. The result was, that the Greeks objected, and Russia again interfered, on the ground that it would lead to the Protectorate of France, and to meet the difficulty a second Commission was formed, composed entirely of Turkish Ulemas and officials, excluding the partisans of both Churches ; and this Commission gave its decision *that the Latins have no right to claim exclusive possession of the Holy Places* ; and a Firman of the Sultan being issued, a Turkish Bey was sent to Jerusalem to see that it was carried out ; but, unfortunately, it was not acted upon, and Russia determined, in consequence of this deception and double-dealing of Turkey, to send Prince Menschikoff on a Special Mission to Constantinople, which so aroused the French Government, that they ordered the French fleet to proceed from Toulon to Salamis.

Prince Menschikoff was the bearer of two documents : one a personal letter to the Sultan, and the other an official communication containing the demands of Russia ; and these demands were considered arbitrary ; but, having read this official communication, I fail to find in it any audacious demand, and there is no doubt *its acceptance or rejection* was the *turning point* in the history of the complications.

At one time Turkey was on the point of accepting the demand of Russia ; but alas ! owing to *the fatal counsels* given to the Sultan by the British Ambassador, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, in which he warned him of the danger to which his Empire was exposed by its acceptance ; and to support him in the crisis he *promised* the presence of the British War Squadron.

In face of such counsel, and such potential power displayed by England, it is no surprise that Turkey rejected Russia's reasonable demand ; *a rejection that England alone was responsible for*, because Lord Stratford de Redcliffe declared in plain words to the Sultan, that he had better incur all the hazards of war than accept Russia's proposals.

In consequence of this rejection, Prince Menschikoff left Constantinople, and his mission *closed*, and England and France, wishing to act as mediators, agreed to a Joint Note ; and this Despatch was agreed to by France, England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, and recommended to Turkey as one which she might accept *without injury* to her independence or honour.

When, however, the Note was sent to Constantinople Turkey con-

sidered it was *as bad as Prince Menschikoff's former proposals*, and proposed certain modifications, which, having been submitted to the respective Governments, were finally agreed to, and returned to Constantinople for acceptance ; but the Turkish Council, *inspired by the fanaticism and desperation of the old Mahommedan party*, fearful that peace would be established, and that they would lose *the great opportunity* of dragging England and France into a war with their ancient enemy Russia, came to the extraordinary resolution to reject these reasonable terms of peace and decided in favour of war ; and the result was, the Russians crossed the Pruth, and entered the Principalities, and the English and French fleet anchored in Besika Bay.

These acts of war did not suspend the negotiations for peace ; but it soon became evident that Turkey, seeing that she had committed England and France in the quarrel, *determined to rush into war*, in spite of the utmost efforts of the European Powers.

“ The Turkish Council,” says Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, “ has given its decision for war, and the efforts of the four Powers to obtain a pacific solution, are fruitless.”

Now just observe the facts :

*England* offers her mediation between Turkey and Russia, and as the friend of Turkey, the British fleet is brought up to the Dardanelles to support her resistance.

*England* advises Turkey in the most emphatic manner, in consort with France, Austria, and Prussia, *not to declare war*, but Turkey declared war in *the very teeth of her advice*.

*England* appeals to Turkey to suspend hostilities whilst further negotiations are pending, and she promises, *and breaks that promise, and rushes into war*.

*England* warns Turkey, not only that a war will entail *great calamities*, but that it will eventually lead to the dissolution of her tottering Empire ; but she insists on going to war, in face of the warnings of England ; and when Turkey does *all this*, *scorns all the declarations* of England, England suffered herself to be dragged helplessly at the tail of *the fanatical Turk* into the abyss of war.

Unfortunately, the public mind in England *was a victim to a fanaticism as fierce as the fanaticism of the Turks*, in consequence of a *frantic hatred of Russia and its Sovereign*, which was fanned by the Press, the Platform, and alas ! the Pulpit !

We see, therefore, that the original blunder was committed when the Turks were advised by England to resist, and the second blunder when the Turks were supported in their rejection of the Vienna Note,

for the moment that the Four Great Powers, admitted that their recommendations were not of necessity to be accepted by Turkey, they put themselves entirely in the hands of Turkey to be dragged into War.

The course taken by Turkey in risking War, was against the strong advice of her Allies, and therefore England ought to have told her from the first, "If you persist in taking your own course, we cannot be involved in the difficulty to which it may give rise, but must leave you to take the consequences of your own acts."

Unhappily the Government of Lord Aberdeen and the English Nation were actuated by a bitter hostility to Russia, and they imagined the War was necessary for European freedom, and to cripple the resources of Russia. Nothing could have been more impolitic, or more reprehensible.

The aggrandisement of Russia and the "*balance of power*" were the bugbears raised to justify the War; and in reality it was *on this cry* that the whole question eventually turned; "but," said Mr. Bright in a great speech delivered in Parliament, "if this phrase '*balance of power*' is always to be an argument for War, the pretence for War will never be wanting, and peace can never be secured."

*This absurd idea* of the "balance of power" is a delusion, and we ought to drive it from our minds, and to consider the *solemn question* of Peace or War on *more clear, more definite, and on far higher principles* than any that are involved in the "*balance of power*."

In the Message from the Crown, on the opening of Parliament in 1854, the Government declared the three great objects of the war for which the efforts and resources of England were to be given.

1. To maintain the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire; 2. To curb the aggression of Russia; 3. To defend the interests of England.

1. To maintain the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire.

This is to maintain a fierce military despotism, allied with the fanaticism of a brutalising religion which teaches its followers to rely solely on the sword, and to disdain all improvements; ruled by a Sultan who sways the lives and destinies of the people with an absolute power, greater than was ever shewn by any tyrant of ancient times.

It is to maintain a nation of men who know nothing about Commerce, and care as little about its freedom; who despise Trade, and despise it in others.



It is to maintain a nation whose "Koran" says: "There is but one law, and that law forbids all communication with infidels."

Such a system of Government, with such a policy, is nothing but a tyrannical despotism at once sanguinary and lawless.

In my opinion it is not the alliance of England, or the presence of foreign arms on Turkish soil, that can secure the "integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire;" but only by a wiser Executive Government, a better financial administration of its affairs, and juster laws.

2. To curb the aggressions of Russia. These are catching words, and they served unhappily to blind the eyes of the English nation thirty years ago.

The Russians accused by England forsooth! of being an aggrandising Power, that from the day of Pultowa in 1817, to the crossing of the Pruth in 1854, the Government of Russia have been incessantly advancing! But in the meantime has England been idle? If during the last century, Russia has advanced, Great Britain has in the same period, enlarged the bounds of Her Dominions.

Surely England, staggering under the weight of her vast Empire, is not the Nation to preach to Russia a sermon on peace, based on the Eighth Commandment!

To resist the aggression of Russia! You might as well tell Mrs. Partington to keep the Atlantic back with a Mop, or to bid Canute say to the proud waves of the ocean, "Thus far thou shalt go, and no further!" You cannot dismember Russia, nor blot out her name from the Map, nor her history from the records of Europe.

Russia will always be there, always powerful, always watchful, and actuated by the same motives of an advancing civilisation.

But supposing for one moment Russia had become possessed of Constantinople, would not the consequences have been favourable to humanity and civilisation?

We may answer with Mr. Cobden, instead of the seraglio of the Sultan, we should have seen the Palace of a Christian Monarch: instead of the harem, the presence of a Christian Empress; and instead of the chains of the slave, the voices of men and women of exalted birth, and the sound of the footsteps of ambassadors, merchants, and capitalists, from all the Capitals of Europe.

Can anyone doubt that if the Government of St. Petersburg had been transferred to the shores of the Bosphorus, that a splendid European Capital would soon have sprung up, in the place of those miserable hovels, which now constitute the Capital of Turkey, that noble



edifices would have arisen, learned Societies flourished, Arts and Science prospered, in fact, with her natural beauties and advantages, Constantinople would have become an attractive rendezvous for civilised Europe, that the Christian religion would have improved the condition of the people, that the slave market, which is now polluting the East, centuries after the odious traffic has been banished from the soil of Christian Europe, would have been abolished ?

Can anyone doubt, that these and many other beneficent changes would not have been realised, and that the interests of England would not have been imperilled, by curbing the aggressions of civilisation and commerce, by Russia in the East ?

The first great disaster of the War, was the destruction of the Turkish Fleet at Sinope, on the shore of the Black Sea. The Turkish Commander aware of his danger pressed for reinforcements, but none came, and on 30th November, 1853, the Russian Squadron swooped down upon the Turkish Squadron, and after a desperate struggle, the latter was destroyed, and this disaster, forced England and France to send their Naval Squadrons into the Black Sea, to compel every Russian ship to return to Sevastopol, and to resist by force any aggression against Ottoman territory. This was in fact a Declaration of War.

England's Ultimatum to Russia was despatched on February 27th, 1854, and at the end of six days, no reply being received, the Declaration of War was read, from the steps of the Royal Exchange in the City.

The forces of England, under the command of Lord Raglan, and the forces of France, under the command of Marshal St. Arnaud, assembled at Varna in the summer of 1854, and under the cover of the Fleet landed in the Crimea, an invasion which was as great a blunder as was the declaration of War, a blunder of military strategy attributed to the Emperor of the French, but, whoever advised it, it was a stupendous act of military folly.

On the 14th September, 1854, the Allied forces disembarked, some 10,000 strong, and on the 19th marched forward to battle, encountering the dense masses of the Russians, under the command of Prince Menschikoff, on the heights of Alma ; and though the soldiers of the Czar fought stubbornly, they could not stand up against the vehement obstinacy of the Allies, and in a few hours the allied victory was won.

Had this victory been followed up as it ought to have been, had an immediate advance been made on Sevastopol, not only would this renowned fortress have been taken ere the sun went down, but the disastrous campaign in the Crimea would never have been heard

of; and for this second blunder it is said the French commander, Marshall St. Arnaud, was to blame.

From the Alma the Allies moved forward to Balaclava, and occupied the heights, and on Oct. 17th the first attack was made on Sevastopol, but it was a month too late, and of course it failed.

On Oct. 25th the Russians fiercely attacked the Allies, which is memorable for the famous charge of the Light Brigade; the charge of the 600, of whom only 198 came back, and of which it may truly be said, "C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas guerre."

Then followed the great Battle of Inkermann, on the 5th November, the *soldiers' battle*, which was the fiercest battle of the war.

It would occupy too much space to follow all the dark days of the Crimean campaign, the terrible winter during which more men died by exposure and cold than by the bayonet and bullet; but I cannot forbear to mention the name of that great heroine of the war, Florence Nightingale, who, in the midst of the horrors of that war, like some "*Angel of Mercy*," touched by the piercing cry of men perishing with cold, hunger, and disease, went forth to the East, assisted by a little army of chivalrous women, and rendered splendid service, and which laid the foundation of the Geneva Convention and the noble Army of the Red Cross.

At this period of the War, disaster followed disaster, which the death of Lord Raglan, and the death of the Czar Nicholas of Russia, intensified.

During the lull caused by the defeat of the Government by the vote of censure moved by Mr. Roebuck, negotiations for peace were set on foot, and a Conference met at Vienna, but it proved a failure, and the operations in the Crimea were renewed with increased vigour.

Desperate efforts were made by Russia to raise the siege of Sevastopol, but all was unavailing; and the Allies, bracing themselves up to a great effort, on September 5th, 1855, captured the Malakoff and Redan, which was accompanied by a terrible bombardment from sea and land; and Sevastopol, after a memorable siege of twelve months, fell, and "great was the fall thereof."

With the fall of Sevastopol, the war was practically at an end; and on the 25th February, 1856, a Congress of the Plenipotentiaries of Europe assembled at Paris, and one month afterwards, the Treaty of Peace was signed.

Thus closed, as Mr. Bright declared, "that measureless calamity, the Crimean War," a War that involved the death of 900,000 men, and which cost the belligerents, Russia, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Turkey, £340,000,000 sterling.

## THE TWELFTH WAR: IN OUDE.

1856.

Thirty years ago, it may truly be said, that England was constantly enacting, in various parts of the world, deeds of arbitrary and high-handed violence; for doing one-tenth of which we should deem ourselves entitled to brand other nations with the strongest language of indignation, and even undertake to inflict sanguinary punishment upon them, as the minister of Divine vengeance.

One of these exploits of violence by England was the annexation in 1856 by the armed forces of the Crown of the kingdom of Oude in India.

Oude, a kingdom as populous as Belgium, and twice as large in extent of territory, was annexed to the East India Company by the proclamation of Lord Dalhousie, and its ruler deprived of his Throne.

Troops invaded Oude, and surrounded his capital, but as he offered no resistance, beyond protest, the destruction of an ancient Throne, and the annexation of a rich and populous kingdom, was easily effected.

In the proclamation the usual charges of incompetency and corruption were made, but, whatever the faults of the government of Oude, it had ever been faithful and true in their friendship with the British nation; but this fidelity and friendship availed them nothing when the fiat went forth from Leadenhall Street, that the kingdom of Oude must cease to exist.

The only defence put forward was, that it was for the good of the natives, but has that not ever been the pretext of every War of annexation, whether by England or any other nation? and this plea of the East India Company and of Lord Dalhousie for annexing Oude, had no better foundation.

---

## THE THIRTEENTH WAR: PERSIAN WAR.

IN 1857.

In 1857 the Governor-General of India, Lord Canning, acting under the authority of Her Majesty's Government, issued a proclamation, which was tantamount to a declaration of War against Persia.

A hostile fleet, amounting to forty ships of the line and 6,000 fighting men, sailed for the Persian Gulf. Now what was it all about?

In the beginning of the century, England made great efforts to establish a predominant influence in Persia, in order to resist (*not Russia* this time) but a French invasion of India.

Sir John Malcolm was sent therefore, to form an alliance with the Persian Monarch, and he concluded two Treaties with the Shah, one against the Ameer of Afghanistan, and the other against the French, and by the first Treaty England was bound to aid Persia to recover Khorassan from Afghanistan.

Up to 1828 English influence was paramount in Persia, but when the Shah declared war against Russia in 1828, and was defeated by Marshal Paskiewitch, the Russian General, from that moment English influence steadily declined in Persia.

The English disasters in Afghanistan in 1842, and the defeat of English policy, may also have influenced the Shah of Persia and his Ministers to disregard and practically to reject the advice and interference of England, through its Minister at Teheran; but, whatever the cause, suffice it to say that, after having committed those monstrous outrages upon Dost Mahommed, the Ameer of Afghanistan, we took him suddenly in our favour and championed the Afghan cause, and the plea put forward was the possession of Herat, which had been for generations a Perso-Afghan quarrel.

It was, however, alleged that an infraction of the Treaty of 1853, entered into by England and Persia, was the pretext assigned for this Persian war.

But the plea of an infraction of this Treaty in regard to the possession of Herat, was only a pretext on the part of England.

The real object was to take violent possession of certain positions on Persian soil, to give England command of the navigation of the Euphrates, and of the railway which was contemplated in the valley of the Euphrates.

The expedition was sent out to the Persian Gulf, and success followed its operations; Bushire was captured, and after a great loss of life, and a great expenditure of money, the war was brought to a close by a Treaty of Peace, negotiated at Paris, by which Persia withdrew from Herat, and paid compensation for damages inflicted, and gave assurances for her future good conduct, and finally the Prime Minister of the Shah was dismissed from office.

Thus closed a war waged for objects which might have been secured without war; a war that cost £1,865,435; a war, be it

remembered, commenced, carried on, and concluded without Parliament having an opportunity to pronounce an opinion on its necessity, justice, or expediency.

---

## THE FOURTEENTH WAR: MUTINY IN INDIA.

1857.

One of the most appalling catastrophes, appalling in its ferocity and its unspeakable horrors, which has marked the reign of Queen Victoria, and which must be numbered amongst the Wars of Her Majesty's Reign, was the terrible Mutiny in India in 1857.

For some years previously, ominous mutterings of discontent had been heard in the Indian Army, and Sir Charles Napier, during his military Command, did his utmost to convince the authorities that they were sleeping on a thin crust of a volcano, which might at any moment explode into a tremendous conflagration.

Various were the reasons assigned for the grave apprehension which threatened to undermine the foundation of English rule in India, chiefly diplomatic and military—the recent annexation of Oude, the interference with the Hindoo system of religion, and the objection felt by the native soldiery to greased cartridges; these and other causes combined to organise the blackest conspiracy and treason against English rule.

A deaf ear was turned to these warnings, and even signs of mutiny in the Native Regiments in Bengal were treated very lightly; when, suddenly, the alarming tidings arrived, on Sunday, 10th May, 1857, that Regiment after Regiment had risen in mutiny; that more than 30,000 men were in revolt; that Delhi, the ancient Capital of the Moguls, was in possession of the rebels, who had massacred all the Europeans, and proclaimed the descendant of the Great Mogul as their King.

It was at Meerut that the tiger-like ferocity of the Sepoy soldiery was displayed. They fired upon their officers, killed their loyal comrades, broke open the gaol and massacred the European inhabitants. Having done all this, they marched, or rather rushed—for Delhi, burst into the city, swarmed into the precincts of the



Palace of the King, and proclaimed him Emperor of India, planting the standard of rebellion against English rule on the battlements of his Palace. They found in one moment a Leader, a Flag, and a Cause, and the mutiny was transfigured into a revolutionary War.

When the news of the revolution reached Calcutta, it came with the shock of a thunderbolt from the blue.

Fortunately, there was at the head of affairs in India a man with a cool head, a firm will, and a courage that never faltered.

If ever the crisis found the man, Lord Canning was the man called for by that crisis in India.

Most important, too, Canning was surrounded and supported by brave and able men—Sir John Lawrence, and his brother Sir Henry Lawrence, in the Punjaub, Sir Henry Havelock, Sir James Outram, Sir Colin Campbell, and many others, who, by their intrepidity in the field, and their sagacity in the Council, largely contributed to the safety of our Indian Empire.

Canning saw that the right course was to strike at Delhi, the headquarters of the rebellion; and he appealed, therefore, for the help of the troops engaged on the Chinese Expedition and the Persian War.

There was no time to be lost, for the rebellion broke out at new points—in the Punjaub; in Oude; in fact, almost everywhere in the North and the North-Western Provinces of India.

Delhi fell, Lucknow was relieved, and Cawnpore was taken; and this may be considered the final blow in the suppression of the Mutiny, for Delhi and Lucknow were the centres of the movement, and when these strongholds were in the hands of the English the back of the rebellion was broken.

On December 20, 1858, Lord Clyde announced to the Governor-General of India that the campaign was at an end, and that the last remnant of the Mutineers were driven hopelessly at bay.

"*It is an ill wind,*" verily, "*which blows no good,*" for one, if not the principal benefit of this terrible Rebellion in India, it pulled down the famous old Corporation, the East India Company, which had arrogated to itself for nearly a century the Government of 250 millions of people.

Practically before the Mutiny was crushed, this beaureaucratic but irresponsible Corporation came to an end.

Founded in the days of Warren Hastings, nominated partly by the Crown, and partly by the Board of Directors in Leadenhall Street, it gave directions for and controlled absolutely the Government of India.

This unparalleled anomaly in the Government of India directly

this crisis arrived was dissolved, for it was felt that England must for the future take the management of her Indian affairs into her own hands, and that the time had come that the dangerous rule of a "Trading Company" must cease.

In 1858, an Act for the better Government of India, brought into Parliament by Lord Stanley (the present Lord Derby), provided that all the territories under the Government of the East India Company were to be hereafter vested in Her Majesty the Queen of the Empire, and all the powers of the Company in future were alone to be exercised in her name, and, for the first time in our Indian history, the Viceroy of the Queen was to be supreme in the political and military administration of India.

---

## THE FIFTEENTH WAR: THE SECOND CHINA WAR.

1857.

In the beginning of the year 1857, England became suddenly involved in a war, the second war with China, which arose from the following circumstances:—

In October, 1856, the authorities at Canton boarded a steamer in the river called the "Arrow," on the ground that pirates were on board, one of whom was afterwards identified by a merchant as part of a pirate fleet that had attacked his ship, plundered the cargo, and killed four of the crew.

On the day that the "Arrow" was boarded, Mr. Parkes, the English Consul in Canton, demanded that the men should be given up; and on its refusal, he demanded an apology, which ended with a threat, that if China did not yield in four hours, violent means would be taken.

The only ground taken for this haughty demand was, that the "Arrow" was a British vessel, and that the Treaty of 1842 was violated, and the British flag insulted.

But was the "Arrow" a British vessel? She was built by Chinese, owned by Chinese, manned by Chinese, with the exception of one Englishman. How then could she be a British vessel?

The defence was that she carried the British flag, and pleaded

British protection ; and under this pretence she was licensed to carry on a large smuggling trade in opium, in open violation of the laws of China.

Even Sir John Bowring, the British Ambassador at Hong-Kong, acknowledged :

“ That it appears on examination that the ‘ Arrow ’ had no right to hoist the British flag ; the license to do so had expired, from which date, she has not been entitled to protection.”

And yet, in face of this declaration, Sir John Bowring coolly demanded from the Chinese Government an apology and an assurance that the British flag should in future be respected.

Well might Perronnet Thompson declare in the House of Commons that there was evidence of a foregone conclusion to quarrel with the Chinese ; a wretched and dishonourable subterfuge was got up about a miserable boat. “ It was a War,” cried the honorable gentleman, “ for the British Flag, the British Lion, and the British Flag, and evidence had now come there was no British Flag at all.”

For this tremendous insult to the British Flag, the British Squadron, under command of Admiral Seymour, attacked the river forts at Canton, sunk or burned twenty-three Vessels belonging to the Chinese Navy, and bombarded the City of Canton, crowded with one and a half millions of inhabitants, packed like sheep in a pen.

A writer in the *Friend of China* thus describes the bombardment.

“ Firing commenced from the Men-of-War, of shot and ball as fast as it could be thrown into the City, and this terrific bombardment continued for five hours.”

“ And then followed the next day a second and more terrible bombardment, which by firing shot and shell into the City all night caused widespread ruin and death.”

If anyone had told Sir John Bowring twenty years before, when he was prominent in philanthropy, and peace, and humanity, that the time would come when he would be the man to direct the bombardment with shot and shell of a populous and defenceless commercial City, involving the wholesale slaughter of men and women and children, and THAT on the most trivial and contemptible excuse ever assigned as a justification of hostilities, he might have exclaimed, “ Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing ? ” And yet he did do it, under the blind fanaticism of his officialism.

But we will draw the curtain over so pitiable a spectacle, and see the result of the War.

By the Treaty of Peace, signed at Tien-sin, 26th June, 1858, it

was agreed that religious toleration should be extended throughout the Empire; Trade protected and a revised Tariff; an English Minister to reside at Peking; the promise of a Chinese Ambassador in London; nine Chinese Ports to be opened to British commerce; the free navigation of the Yang-tse-Kiang; passports granted to British subjects travelling in China; the suppression of piracy; and an indemnity to England; and, I believe, one more provision—the Chinese bound themselves by solemn obligations not to call Englishmen nick-names—either Barbarians! Niggers! or Yankees!

---

## THE SIXTEENTH WAR: THE THIRD CHINA WAR.

1859.

Hardly had the ink of the Treaty of Tien-sin become dry, barely had its Provisions become ratified and understood by both Nations, than hostilities were once more declared by England against China in 1859.

I will endeavour to state the causes as clearly and as concisely as possible.

One of the articles of the late Treaty which closed the "Lorcha Arrow" War, was the right to send an English Ambassador to Peking, but the Chinese felt such a repugnance to this step that the enforcement of the right was postponed.

It was necessary, however, for the ratification of the Treaty of Tien-sin that Mr. Bruce, on behalf of England, and M. Bourboulon, on behalf of France, should go to Peking; but when they arrived at Shanghai they found the Chinese Commissioner declined to see them until they arrived at Peking.

To make the Embassy imposing, the English and French Ambassadors were accompanied by an Armed Squadron, twenty Vessels of War and several hundred Marines, to force, if necessary, admission to Peking.

This formidable armament at the mouth of the Peiho, awoke suspicion and jealousy, and the inevitable result, a refusal to proceed with so menacing a Convoy.

What should we say if a French Ambassador, charged with a

similar duty, declined to land at Dover and come to London by rail, but insisted upon being conveyed up the Thames by a Squadron of French ironclads and gunboats, and anchoring them at the Port of London?

That does not signify.

The Chinese must be chastised, the prestige of the British Arms restored at any cost; the Nations of the East must be taught the absolute invincibility of England.

Accordingly, diplomacy once more is drowned in the boom of the Cannon.

Rear Admiral Hope is ordered up the Peiho to force his way by violence to Peking; but the attempt failed, several of the gunboats were disabled or sunk, 434 officers and men killed or wounded, and the Squadron was obliged to return to Shanghai, and await orders and reinforcements.

France and England lost no time in avenging the insult offered, and the defeat sustained by the Allied forces; and Lord Elgin being appointed British Plenipotentiary in China, a powerful Expedition was fitted out under the Chief Command of Sir Hope Grant.

Tangchow was attacked and captured, and the whole of the Taku forts were bombarded and occupied.

The Chinese Government then proposed to negotiate for Peace, and Admiral Hope proceeded to Tien-sin and occupied it, and Messrs. Parkes and Wade proceeded with the draft of the Convention, but, owing to treachery the negotiations were suspended, and the army advanced to the assault of Peking and captured it and the Summer Palace of the Emperor, where they obtained an abundant harvest of spoil; and the terms of Peace were accepted and signed at Peking on the 24th October, 1860.

Amongst its chief Provisions the Emperor of China made an abject apology; the British Ambassador was authorised to reside permanently at Peking; an indemnity of £2,750,000 was agreed to be paid; the port of Tien-sin opened to trade; and the province of Kwang-tang (Canton) was ceded to England as a dependency of the British Colony of Hong-Kong.

---



## THE SEVENTEENTH WAR: IN JAPAN.

1863.

It is not possible, said Mr. Richard, for Englishmen to go anywhere without marking their steps with fire and blood; and this remark, *if true*, has a certain application in the causes of the War with Japan in 1863.

British intercourse with Japan shows that, first of all, Englishmen thrust themselves upon them in the teeth of all their strong prejudices, and then compelled them, at the mouth of the Cannon, to enter into a Treaty of Commerce with us; but, further, they affront their feelings and violate their customs; and having by these means provoked them, exact from them demands, and in default scatters havoc and ruin amongst them. The War against Japan in 1863 may be traced to these causes, and the incident which provoked this War was as contemptible as it was disgraceful.

It appears three English gentlemen and a lady, whose names deserve notoriety—Mr. Richardson, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Marshall, and Mrs. Borrodaile, were riding on the high road leading from Yokohama to Yeddo.

At a distance of several miles from Yokohama they met a Procession of Princes, and, as it is customary for all people who meet such Processions to retire at their approach, or to kneel while it passes (neither of which they would do), though they had been warned repeatedly of it, they were attacked, and one of the party killed.

The representative of England made a demand for reparation:—

1. An ample apology.
2. The payment of £100,000.
3. The trial and execution of the guilty parties; and, in the event of refusal, the Admiral of the Fleet on the Eastern Station to take what measures he thought necessary.

The Government of Japan conceded two of the demands—the apology and the payment of £100,000; but this not being sufficient, and without attempting any further negotiations, Vice-Admiral Kuper was ordered to enforce the demand.

The British Squadron bombarded Kagiosima, with its population of 180,000 souls, and soon the whole Town was in flames, and laid in ruins.

The bombardment continued two days. At the end of the first day's operations the ships in the harbour and one half of the Town were in flames, and the following day the bombardment was continued,

and the palace of the Prince shelled, and, says the Admiral, "*The entire town of Kagiosima is now a mass of ruins.*"

Well might Mr. Cobden, in writing on this barbaric act of the British Admiral, denounce this cruel proceeding :—

"Picture," said Mr. Cobden, "this great Commercial Centre reduced in forty-eight hours to a heap of ashes ; try to realise the fate of its population, and then ask what great crime they had committed to bring on themselves this havoc and destruction ?"

To the shame and confusion of England the answer must be, that this was the way in which English men, under the command of Admirals Kuper and Neale, administer justice for the murder of an individual 10,000 miles away, of which crime the inhabitants of Kagiosima were guiltless of all knowledge and complicity, and afterwards the Chief Actors in this outrage on humanity, coolly laid claim to the approbation of the British Nation.

## THE EIGHTEENTH WAR: IN NEW ZEALAND.

1860-64.

A writer in 1864 well observed: "It would be difficult to put one's finger upon a single year within the century when Englishmen were not engaged in shedding human blood."

From the day of British Colonization in New Zealand this terrible charge, alas ! is too true. British policy in New Zealand has been to exterminate the noblest aboriginal race which British adventure and British prowess has subjugated ; and this fate of the Maories is all the more shocking, when we remember how much Missionaries have done to effect their civilization.

What was the cause of the New Zealand War ? It arose out of a purchase of land of 600 acres from one chief, called Teira, which was claimed by another chief, called Kingi ; a tract of land purchased by the Governor of New Zealand. The invalidity of the purchase was generally recognised, and therefore the injustice of the War. A sanguinary struggle in the Province of Taranaki was the result ; and, at its close, Governor Sir George Grey, who had succeeded Governor Brown, ordered that the land should be restored to its lawful

owner; but before this act of restitution was done, irreparable mischief had been effected.

The New Zealanders had made up their minds that, whatever might be our professions, our intention was *slowly but surely* to despoil them of their right to the soil. The war in 1864 was therefore the sequence of the war in 1860, as the Maories considered they were not really defeated; that they were in possession of Taranaki, which they regarded as a conquest.

The result was that, when a military force was sent to resume possession of Taranaki, the military escort were attacked and killed. The first shot having been fired, War became inevitable.

The War-cry raised in Taranaki was the signal for the tribe of Warikatos, who sympathised with their fellow-countrymen, to rise in rebellion.

For a time Auckland was in danger; but the energy of General Cameron saved it, and confined the War to a narrow limit.

The New Zealanders were treated as "*rebels*," taunted as "*niggers*," and branded as "*traitors*," and threatened with spoliation, and they naturally rose in Arms: and who will blame them, for England might have ensured their loyalty by a policy of justice and conciliation? The policy of England, under the influence of a Military faction, was to exterminate the Maories, and thus secure Peace; but it was the Peace of the Tomb, a Peace that could only cover England with dishonour.



## THE NINETEENTH WAR: IN ABYSSINIA.

1867.

The unhappy complication and War in Abyssinia is a striking instance of the tendency of Englishmen to meddle with what does not concern them.

It appears that in 1840, Mr. Walter Plowden persuaded Lord Palmerston to appoint him Consul for Abyssinia, and the year following, acting in the name of England, he negotiated a Treaty with *Ras-Ali*, the Ruler of Gondar, for at that time he was waging a War with his rebellious subjects.

In 1854, *Ras-Ali* was overthrown by his son-in-law *Theodore*, who, of course, repudiated the Treaty the former had made with England, and soon afterwards poor Mr Plowden fell into the hands of the rebels of King Theodore, and was killed.

It would have been well at this juncture if the English Government had not appointed a successor, for the uselessness of having Consular relations with this barbaric Monarch had been amply proved ; but notwithstanding the protest of the Ruler of Abyssinia, Capt. Cameron was appointed, who, as it afterwards turned out, was most unfit for the position ; and as proof of it, when King Theodore refused to receive him as Consul, and desired him to leave the Capital, and when Lord Russell, in April, 1863, instructed him to carry out the King's wishes, to return to Massowah and there remain until further orders, Cameron refused to do so, but actually interfered in the public affairs of Abyssinia ; for he sided with the enemies of the King, denounced him as a murderer—which invoked the hostility of the King, and the inevitable result was that he was imprisoned.

To secure his release M. Rassam was sent as intercessor, but the King detained everyone who went to him ; and the reason assigned was, that the Abyssinian Monarch having written a courteous letter to the English Government, no notice was taken of it, and in fact it was never answered, for it was subsequently found in the pigeon holes of the Foreign Office, unattended to, and unopened.

No doubt the Expedition was conducted with great energy and skill, and it is only just to Lord Napier to admit it was conducted in as humane a spirit as the arbiter of War can secure, no cruelty or plunder having been practised upon the people, and we must all rejoice that the British Consul and the Missionaries were released from their captivity ; but, it must be admitted that they *had no business* in that barbarous land at all, and but for their folly in going—or the folly of those who sent them—the £8,000,000 sterling which that War cost, and the valuable lives lost, now buried in the mountains of Abyssinia, would have been saved.

---

## THE TWENTIETH WAR : IN ASHANTEE.

1873.

The Ashantee War originated, strange as it may sound, in the Straits of Malacca, which is known as the Gate of Commerce between Europe and the China Seas ; and which, in 1809, England was asked to surrender to Holland, in order to secure a cession of the Dutch territories on the Gold Coast.

In this cession one would naturally suppose the two parties should have been consulted. First, the natives on the Gold Coast it was proposed to transfer ; and, secondly, the King of Ashantee, whose rights and position at Elmina, and access to the sea, were largely affected. But, though the interests of the Coast Tribes, and of the King of Ashantee, were largely involved, their consent were not obtained.

On the contrary, every kind of pretext was made against the transfer by King *Koffee Kallali*, for, in his letter to the English Government, he used these words :—

*“ I hope your Excellency will not include Elmina in the change, for it is mine by Right.”*

And the Chief of Elmina declared—

*“ On no account will we become English. Elmina is willing to serve under the Dutch flag, and no other.”*

The Convention was signed in 1871, and the transfer of the Territory was effected in 1872, without either the King of Ashantee having renounced his claim, or the Chiefs of Elmina approved of the cession to English Rule ; and, as a last protest, they sent an Address to the States-General of the Netherlands against the sale of their Territory, and refused to hoist the English flag.

The central difficulties were—the Elmina tribute to the King of the Ashantees, the free access to the Coast, and the presence of the Chief of the Elminas in the Territory ; and yet the English Government, aware of these facts, signed and ratified the Convention without procuring the settlement of either.

In January, 1873, news arrived at Cape Coast Castle of the invasion by the Ashantees of the disputed territory, and the War having broken out, it was necessary to alienate the Elminas ; but when the oath of allegiance was tendered them and refused, they were made prisoners and sent to Cape Coast Castle, and the War now became general.

Elmina, a town of 10,000 inhabitants, was bombarded and destroyed,



and Sir Garnet Wolseley, having taken the chief command, advanced into the Ashantee country.

There was the usual slaughter by the Gatling gun when opportunity afforded, especially at the Battle of *Amoaful*; and eventually Coomassie was reached, bombarded, and destroyed; and General Wolseley, having won his "famous Victory," marched back again, bringing with him spoils which realised £9,000, and King Koffee's Umbrella as the principal trophy to lay at the feet of Her Majesty the Queen: a Victory, which cost England the lives of many brave men, and £1,000,000 sterling to achieve!

---

## THE TWENTY-FIRST WAR: IN THE TRANSVAAL.

1877.

The Transvaal has passed through many and great difficulties, and the South African Republic has had a rough struggle for existence.

There have been fierce and bloody wars between the Dutch of the Transvaal and the Kaffirs for existence, in which acts of savage cruelty were followed by bitter retaliation.

There was an attempt to unite the two Republics under one Government, but England interfered, and declared that such proceedings would annul the Conventions of 1852 and 1854.

There was a dispute with the Griquas, and England broke the Sand River Treaty.

There had been internal dissensions, for the land was rich, and of great extent, and the people few, and there was not that patriotism which induces men to make great sacrifices for their common country.

Then, there were internal wars with Secoceni, and frontier wars with Cetywayo, and the English Government interfering; so that there is no doubt the Transvaal has passed through great difficulties, and, to make matters worse, the English Government, professing that it feared something might happen which would endanger the English possessions at the Cape, sent, in 1877, Sir Theophilus Shepstone to investigate the state of affairs, and to advise the Boers.

There had been a clamour for annexation from the English

colonists, but the Boers believed that the Mission of Sir Theophilus Shepstone was a friendly one, and received it in a friendly manner ; and this friendliness was taken as a proof that the Boers desired annexation.

Sir Theophilus Shepstone took with him a small escort of mounted police ; but the Boers knew that the entire armed Power of England was at his back, but they did not know that he held a Commission in his pocket which was to be the deathblow to their Independence.

Sir Theophilus Shepstone arrived in Prætoria in January, 1877, and in April, *in direct defiance of the wishes of the people*, he issued a proclamation, *arbitrarily annexing a territory as large as France*, containing a population of 40,000 whites, and 250,000 blacks.

When the news reached England, people did not understand it, and very few stood up manfully for the Rights of the Boers ; but, on the contrary, Tories and Liberals, with few noble exceptions, joined hands in the annexation, and sang a chorus of joy over this wanton violation of popular rights.

At this time Lord Carnarvon was busy over his scheme for a South African Confederation, and he did not stop to enquire whether the Transvaal Volksraad sanctioned it. All he wished to know was, that a large proportion of the Boers desired the establishment of Her Majesty's Authority and English Rule.

The President of the Boer Republic and the Volksraad protested against the deed, and a deputation, consisting of Messrs. Kruger, De Toit and Smit, was sent to England to plead for justice for their country, and when Lord Carnarvon told them that their people desired annexation they were astounded and denied it.

The deputation returned, and organised an agitation against England, and to counteract it, Sir Theophilus Shepstone issued a proclamation to *imprison, fine, and punish* all opponents ; and when the Deputies held a meeting at Pretoria, to plead for the restoration of their independence, the representative of England directed Cannon upon the Assembly and he called up troops to overawe them.

In spite of this, however, the Memorials poured in, signed by *6591 enfranchised men against*, and only *587 enfranchised men for the annexation*.

The charge against the Boers was that they had established slavery on their territory ; and that they had practised cruelty towards the natives ; but it was not true.

From the date of the Annexation in April, 1877 till 1880, the Boers contented themselves with peaceable protests and petitions, to

induce the English Government to restore them their Independence.

Whilst the Conservatives were in power the injustice was not acknowledged, and as the authors of the Policy of Annexation, retrocession was impossible ; but in 1880 they read the speeches of Mr. Gladstone, where he said :—

“That the annexation of the Transvaal was dishonourable, and should be repudiated,” and throughout the Transvaal it was felt that if Mr. Gladstone came into power, the hour of their deliverance was at hand, and they calmly awaited the result.

Unfortunately, high as the hopes of the Boers had been raised, the more bitter was their disappointment when they found that the advent of Mr. Gladstone to power in 1880 did not bring them nearer the goal of Independence, for which they were prepared to sacrifice their lives.

In 1881, stung by these falsified promises, they flew to arms, and the ill-fated 94th Regiment was attacked and annihilated on its march to Pretoria.

Then followed Langs Nek and the disaster at Majuba Hill ; the subsequent Conference at O'Neill's Farm, and the negotiations for peace, by which the Transvaal regained their Independence ; a British Resident at Pretoria was accepted, and the payment by the South African Republic of a Debt of £100,000 ; which, far from being a humiliation to England, reflect upon her the highest honour, and especially on the righteous statesmanship of the Prime Minister of England, who, in noble language, declared in effect—

“That the honour of England does not require the putting down of the rebellion *first*, in order afterwards to negotiate with the Boers.

“The honour of the English nation demands that, without further bloodshed, to expiate the wrong committed in 1877, she should recognize the Independence of the Transvaal, and proclaim her wish to live in friendship with a brave people, that has proved itself worthy to be the pioneers of civilization against the despotisms of Africa.”

---

## THE TWENTY-SECOND WAR : THE ZULU WAR.

1878.

In 1878 England was engaged in a strange enterprise in South Africa, for she deliberately, and of malice aforethought, compassed the subjugation of the brave Zulu people. England embarked in an aggressive War, in which failure was not to be thought of, but in which the greater the success, the greater the disgrace.

Surely every true-born Englishman must feel that this Zulu War was a stain on the honor of England.

The War was the direct result of the "spirited foreign policy" of Lord Beaconsfield's Government, and, as a few facts will be necessary, I will endeavour to be just to both sides.

The founder of the Zulu dynasty was a sanguinary despot named Chaka, and his successor to the Throne was Dingaan, the terror of the Boers, and he was succeeded by his son Cetwayo, whose military system was undoubtedly a cruel one, based on the exercise of arbitrary military power.

When the Transvaal was annexed to England (referred to in the last War), Cetwayo expected that England would have arranged the frontier disputes, which had been for many years a bitter source of contention with the Boers.

Unfortunately, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, after his appointment as Administrator of the Transvaal, supported the Boer claim, and to this circumstance and subsequent complications the Zulu War must be attributed.

The disputed territory referred to, lay to the eastward of Zululand, and early in 1878 Sir Henry Bulwer, the Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, appointed Mr. Shepstone and the late Colonel Durnford to enquire into the respective claims of the two States, and this Commission met at Rorke's Drift the Delegates from the Transvaal and of the Zulu King.

The report of the Commission was submitted to Sir Bartle Frere, who had been sent out to the Cape as High Commissioner, with full powers, but Sir Bartle Frere did not give his award till December, 1878, exactly six months after the decision of the Joint Commission was known ; and when Sir Bartle Frere gave his award, instead of it being a Message of Peace, it was a Declaration of War—for it was accompanied by an ultimatum.

The ultimatum contained several demands. (1) That Cetwayo should surrender Sirayo, a powerful Chief, and his two sons, who

had committed some petty larceny in Natal. (2) Pay a fine of 500 head of cattle. (3) To disband his army. (4) To agree never to call out his troops for War, except with the permission of the British Government. (5) To permit every man on coming of age to marry. (6) To secure a fair trial to all offenders. (7) To allow the Missionaries to return. (8) To receive a British Resident at his Capital.

Compliance with these *eight* demands was to be made within thirty days.

Had the Zulus seen their way to accede to some of these demands, no doubt it would have been a gain to civilisation, but surely it was unreasonable to expect them to do so in thirty days !

No nation or people, civilised or uncivilised, could be expected to surrender their Independence, or change their form of Government in Thirty Days !

The King of the Zulus, at the expiration of twenty days, asked for further time to meet these *eight* demands, but the request was refused, and this refusal was the accelerating cause of the War, for it became inevitable, and accordingly on the 12th January, 1879, the British forces crossed the Tugela, and the cruel invasion of Zululand, and an exterminating War against the Zulus commenced.

A more deplorable War, a War more discreditable to England, a professedly civilised and Christian nation, can scarcely be imagined ; and for this War, and the policy which led up to it, the Government of Lord Beaconsfield paid the penalty, by their well-merited overthrow and expulsion from Power in 1880.

It bore its own bitter fruits, the bloody disaster at Isandula ; the terrible sacrifice of human life on both sides, the Zulus alone, estimated at upwards of 20,000, and its consequent results, the reign of terror and of blood in Zululand ; and last but not least the military escapade and sad death of the youthful Napoleon, pierced by the assegais of a people who had never done him, or threatened to do him any harm ; these and many other sickening details brand that War as the most unrighteous, the most inglorious War that defames the honor, and disgraces the Arms of England.

---



## THE TWENTY-THIRD WAR: THE AFGHAN WAR.

1878.

The Afghan War, of 1878, arose from the same miserable causes which led to the disastrous Afghan War in 1842, referred to previously, namely, from a frantic fear and hatred of Russia, which afterwards proved to have been a *mere phantom*.

The causes which led to the War of 1842, and the War of 1878, bears a striking resemblance. In 1842, it was urged on by the will of two men, Lord Palmerston in England, and Lord Auckland in India, against the judgment of most experienced Indian Statesmen at home and abroad.

In 1878, there can be little doubt that its real promoters were Lord Beaconsfield in England, and Lord Lytton in India, the latter inspired by the former; and it is no secret that it was utterly opposed by Lord Lawrence, Lord Northbrook, Sir Charles Trevelyan, and many other eminent men of great weight and experience in Indian affairs.

Public opinion, unhappily, at home was misled, and public passion inflamed by a reckless distortion of facts—on the one hand, that Russia was prompted by a fixed hostility to England, and of a deliberate design to undermine the foundations of our Indian Empire; and, on the other hand, by a *furious abuse of the Ruler of Afghanistan* as a fierce and faithless barbarian, hostile to England, and conspiring with Russia, which, I have no hesitation in saying, was grossly exaggerated.

Now, what are the facts?

A great War, and a most deplorable War (which it was in the power of England to have averted had she compelled Turkey to have accepted the decisions of the Conference at Constantinople), had raged from July, 1877, to March, 1878, between Russia and Turkey, and which had resulted, as everybody knew it would result, in the complete overthrow of the Turkish Power, and the march of the armies of Russia up to the gates of Constantinople.

At that supreme moment, Lord Beaconsfield, as the Prime Minister of England, bid Russia to stay her march, and in effect said to her:—

“Thus far, thou proud wave Romanoff, shalt thou go, and no further,” and he followed up his command by (1) ordering the British Fleet to move up to the Dardanelles; (2) by summoning the military forces of the Crown from India to Malta; (3) by calling out the Reserves; (4) and by a vote of £6,000,000 sterling, in order to hasten forward the preparations for War.

Everybody believed War was inevitable, and Russia, especially, believed it was inevitable between her and England; and at this juncture, when our Government and the Press were uttering the loudest blusters against Russia, a Russian Mission was sent to Cabul.

Here was the real cause of the Afghan War of 1878, a War as cowardly as it was unjust, and for this simple reason, that England *attacked the victim instead of the criminal*; England attacked the helpless and defenceless Afghanistan, rather than the Might and Power of Russia, who was, alike with England, responsible.

At this period, 1878, Shere Ali was Ameer of Afghanistan, and Lord Lytton was Governor-General of India.

During the period of the twenty years Governor-Generalships of India by Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo, and Lord Northbrook, England had no serious trouble in Afghanistan, but from the day when Lord Lytton took the reins of Government, these miserable complications began.

Lord Lytton reversed the policy of his predecessor, Lord Northbrook, and moved an armed force into Beloochistan, occupied Quetta, which commands the Bolan Pass, and is on the high road to Candahar, a policy which alarmed the Ameer, for it was a direct challenge to the freedom and independence of Afghanistan.

This policy was evidently, in the first place, intended to pick a quarrel with the Ameer, and in the second place, to enable the English Government, under pretext of a Russian Embassy to Afghanistan, to seize upon a pretext for War.

On the 13th August, 1878, intelligence reached the Indian Government of the arrival of the Russian Embassy at Cabul, and immediately a British Messenger left Peshawer for Cabul, bearing two letters from the Viceroy, one letter asking for permission for a British Mission under Sir Neville Chamberlain to come to Cabul, to discuss with the Ameer important matters, and the other a letter of condolence on the death of the Ameer's son.

On the 12th September Sir Neville Chamberlain, who was at Peshawer with an escort of 100 sabres and 50 bayonets, ordered Major Cavagnari to move forward, without waiting for the answer and approval of the Ameer; and on reaching Ali Musjid, the Afghan officer in command, Mahommed Khan, went out to meet him, shook hands with the Major, and in a friendly way informed him, as he had no orders, he could not let him pass, and so, after many expressions of friendship, the interview terminated.

This was considered a serious rebuff to the Government of India,

and it accordingly massed a British force on the frontiers, and on the 2nd November an ultimatum was sent to Cabul which involved the issues of Peace or War.

In the meantime a Conference was agreed upon to meet at Peshawar, the Ameer's Minister, Moor Mahommed, and Sir Lewis Pelly, to discuss the question of the admission of British agents to Afghanistan; but, on the 26th of March, the Conference was deferred in consequence of the death of the Afghan Envoy, and, subsequently, on the ground that there was no longer a basis for negotiations, this Conference was finally abandoned at the very time that a fresh Afghan Envoy was on his way to Peshawar, with authority to accept the conditions of the British Government, and the Governor-General of India was aware of this.

The fact was, the door of conciliation was violently slammed in the face of the Ameer, for it was the foregone conclusion of Lord Lytton, the Governor-General of India, to force on a War in Afghanistan, for the overthrow of the Ameer, and of Russian influence at Cabul, and thereby to secure the ascendancy of English control and power under what Lord Beaconsfield described as the shadow of a "*scientific frontier*."

A declaration of War being proclaimed by the Viceroy of India, the British troops advanced, captured Ali Musjid, after a feeble resistance, which was followed by successes at Peiwar-Kotal; and, on the 20th December, Jellabad was entered.

The Ameer, Shere Ali, frightened by these victories, fled from Cabul, and sought protection on Russian soil, for he considered resistance hopeless, and before abandoning the country, released from captivity his son Yakoob Khan, and entrusted to him full powers as Regent. Yakoob lost no time in proceeding to the British headquarters at Gandamuk to make overtures for peace, and on his arrival there, he was received with distinction by the British General, for his succession to the Throne was not disputed, Shere Ali having died of a broken heart at Taskend. On May 26, 1879, a definite Treaty of Peace was signed, which contained conditions for the exclusion of foreign—*i.e.*, Russian—influence from Afghanistan, and a rectification of the frontiers—*i.e.*, the creation of "a scientific frontier" in favour of India.

In accordance with the Treaty, a British Resident was appointed, and on the 24th July Sir P. Cavagnari was cordially received at Cabul, accompanied by a squadron of cavalry and a battalion of infantry, under the command of Lieutenant Hamilton, but their

presence in the capital roused the fanatical hostility of the Afghans and on Sept. 3 they were basely betrayed, and cruelly slain after severe fighting. Immediately on the sad news becoming known the British forces were hurried forward to Cabul from the captured fortresses ; and on the 15th October Generals Roberts, Massey, and Baker having fought several stubbornly-contested battles, made a triumphal entry into the capital, taking Yakoob Khan prisoner.

For some months after these deplorable events, general anarchy and disorder prevailed throughout Afghanistan, for several aspirants for the vacant Throne appeared in the field, the most powerful of whom was Abdurrahman Khan.

At this juncture the General Election in 1880 sealed the fate of the Government of Lord Beaconsfield, and it fell, and this change of administration at home, by the accession of Mr. Gladstone to power, soon caused a change of policy abroad, and as a natural sequence, negotiations for peace and tranquility in Afghanistan were set on foot with Abdurrahman by the new Governor-General of India Marquis of Ripon, but whilst these negotiations were proceeding, the British forces under General Burrows, that were advancing to the relief of Herat, threatened by Yakoob Khan, suffered a crushing defeat by overwhelming forces at Maiwand, his army being practically annihilated after a heroic defence, few only escaping the general massacre which followed.

General Roberts advanced to the rescue a second time, for the victorious Afghan troops pushed rapidly on to Candahar, and oncoming up with them, attacked and routed them, and these bloody conflicts closed this inglorious War, and opened the way for the pacification of this unhappy country, torn by factions and feuds, the result of British intervention.

---



## THE TWENTY-THREE WARS OF QUEEN VICTORIA'S REIGN.

---

FROM 1837 TO 1887.

---

Twenty-four Wars waged by Great Britain during fifty years of Queen Victoria's Reign! Wars declared and waged by the Royal sanction and authority of Her Majesty the Queen, who solemnly declared on her accession to the Throne in 1837 :—

“I rejoice that in ascending the Throne I find the country in amity with all Foreign Powers ; and while I faithfully perform the engagements of my Crown, and carefully watch over the interests of my subjects, it shall be the constant object of my solicitude to preserve the blessings of peace.”

During the fifty years Reign of our beloved Queen Victoria we may rejoice that many great and beneficent measures have been placed on the Statute Book of the Realm, legislation that has conferred lustre on the Crown, honour to Parliament, and that has largely tended to the furtherance of the welfare and prosperity of the people.

Such was the great act of justice and humanity of Negro Emancipation in the Colonies of the Crown, by which, on August 1st, 1838, 800,000 of the coloured race passed from a state of human serfdom into the brighter and better land of human freedom.

Such was the legislative measure devised and promoted by Rowland Hill for the adoption of a uniform rate of Postage, which in spite of opposition, passed into law January 10th, 1846, and that has become, by the enormous impetus to correspondence, a valuable source of revenue to the State, but has also largely extended the fraternal relations of Nations, and thus silently but effectually increased the happiness of millions of the human race.

Such was the legislative measure for the Repeal of the Corn Laws, the abolition of that colossal injustice, the Taxes on Food, won after a great free trade struggle, seven years of untiring efforts by



Cobden, Bright, and Villiers, when one of the greatest Ministers of England, Sir Robert Peel became a convert, a minority became a majority, and was finally passed into law May 26th, 1846, a great achievement, for it conferred on the toiling millions the boon of un-taxed bread.

Such was the important measure for the Repeal of the Excise Duty on Paper, the abolition of the Taxes on Knowledge, one of those great financial measures of reform won by the matchless eloquence of Mr. Gladstone, which became law 15th April, 1861, and thereby opened the avenues of knowledge, of political information and instruction to the great mass of the people, and conferred on the nation the inestimable blessings of a free and a cheap press.

Such was the popular Act for Parliamentary Reform, the enfranchisement of the people, for securing to them the full possession and the free exercise of their political rights ; a great measure of Constitutional Reform, which passed into law August 1st, 1867, that has not only conferred the right of admission into the most ancient legislative Assembly in the world, given permanency and security to the Constitution, but has added lustre and dignity to the Crown of England.

Such was the legislative measure for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Irish Church, which had long been a discredit and a scandal to England, and that by the wonderful statesmanship and genius of Mr. Gladstone on the 26th July, 1871, ceased to exist as the established Church of Ireland ; a great work of peace and justice, enabling the Church of Ireland to enter on a new era, an era bright with hope and potent for good, justifying the impressive words of Mr. Bright when he claimed for the measure :

“The support of all good and thoughtful people within the bounds of the British Empire, and, above all, the blessing of the Supreme ; for I believe it to be founded on those principles of justice and mercy which are the glorious attributes of His Eternal Reign.”

Such, too, were the equally great and beneficent Measures, the Repeal of the Navigation Laws, which has thrown open the whole of the navigation of England and her colonies, and thus secured unrestrained commercial intercourse throughout the world ; the Irish Land Bill, which conferred on the tenants of Ireland security of tenure, facility of transfer, and the acquisition and cultivation of land by statute ; Elementary Education for England and Wales, which brought education, undivorced from religion, within reach of the

poor ; the Ballot, which secured protection to the elector in the free exercise of the political franchise ; the University Test Acts, by which all persons, of whatever religious or political creed, were admitted to the Universities on equal terms ; Church Rates Abolition Bill, which substituted the compulsory payment of Church rates for voluntary exercise.

These and many other peaceful triumphs, won in the Parliament of England,—that august assembly that has inherited through many generations the character for brilliant and courageous legislation,—have been full of blessing to Great Britain, and to that greater Britain beyond the seas ; and combine to mark the Reign of Victoria unequalled for beneficent legislation amongst all the Sovereigns of the House of Brunswick, royal laurels gathered from the field of Peace and not of War, for hath not

“ Peace her triumphs  
Thrice more renowned than War ? ”

Whilst however the reign of Queen Victoria will bear favourable comparison with the most illustrious reigns of English sovereigns, and of the most memorable periods of English history, yet it has its dark and gloomy records, for no period has been more remarkable for its sad catalogue of Wars of aggression, annexation of territories, and conquests of people into subjection under British Dominion, not only without their approval but in spite of their most earnest protestations. No other nation except Russia has shewn such a lust for dominion, and this pride of conquest has resulted in great bloodshed, with all the horrors of war in every quarter of the globe, for the path of British conquest, over the four continents of Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, have been stained by blood, for may we not say of the British Ensign :—

“ It has swept o’er cities of song renowned,  
Silent they lay in the desert around,  
It has crossed proud rivers whose tide hath rolled,  
All dark with the warriors’ blood of old.”

Now what are the lessons which these desolating wars, waged by England, should teach the Statesmen, Parliament, and Government of England ?

Firstly : Non-intervention in the internal affairs of Foreign States, that her policy should be, as Lord Derby declared, “ entangling alliances with no nation but friendly relations with all,” and which Mr. Cobden well expressed, “ as little intercourse betwixt the Governments and as much connection, as possible between the people ; ” for

it rests on the unalterable principle, that no nation has any right to interfere by force of arms in the internal affairs of a Sovereign State, and that any Nation that does so interfere, commits an offence against the great principle of National Right and National Existence.

\* Wheaton and Vattel both concur, that foreign interference in the internal affairs of a Sovereign State is contrary to Natural Law and the fundamental principle of international jurisprudence; and † Ferguson asserts "that this is confirmed by the concurring opinions of the most eminent publicists of all ages and all nations."

"I maintain," says Ferguson, "that no Government has a right to interfere in the affairs of another Government, and if this principle is not admitted, and above all by all people who enjoy a free constitution, no nation could be in security."

Secondly: The abandonment of the "Balance of Power," which has been the most prolific cause of the wars waged by England than any other; and it may be useful to record them in their order of date.

The wars of the Revolution of 1688, which lasted nine years and which terminated in 1697 by the Treaty of Peace of Ryswick, and which cost England £36,000,000.

The War of the Spanish Succession, which commenced in 1702, and lasted eleven years, and which terminated in 1713 by the Treaty of Peace of Utrecht, and cost England £62,500,000.

The War of the Austrian Succession, which commenced in 1739 and lasted nine years, and terminated in 1748 by the Treaty of Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, and cost England £54,000,000.

The Seven Years' War, from 1756 to 1763, terminated by the Treaty of Peace at Paris, and cost England £112,000,000.

The American War, which began in 1775, and terminated by the Treaty of Versailles in 1783, and cost England £136,000,000.

The War of the French Revolution, which began in 1783 and lasted nine years, was terminated in 1793 by the Treaty of Paris, and cost England £404,000,000.

The War against Napoleon Bonaparte, which began in 1803 and lasted twelve years, was terminated in 1815 by the Treaty of Peace at Paris, and cost England £1,159,000,000.

Lastly: The Crimean War, which began in 1853 and lasted three years, and was terminated in 1856 by the Treaty of Peace at Paris, and cost England £69,277,000.

---

\* History of the Law of Nations, pp. 80, 88.

† Manual of International Law, Vol. I pp. 190, 191.

These Wars for the Balance of Power in Europe from 1688 to 1854 cost England £2,093,000,000, which was divided as follows : £1,222,000,000 being the amount raised by taxes and paid for in the current financial years by the willing-hearted taxpayer, and £880,000,000 being raised by loans and consolidated into the National Debt—A Terrible Bill of Blood !

These desolating and costly wars, waged by England for the Balance of Power, were organised under the miserable plea of preserving the equilibrium of power, the safety of Dynasties and the Liberties of Europe ; and this hobgoblin was the constant burden of Royal speeches, the policy of Statesmen, and the theme of orators for the extension of British dominion, and the defence of Treaties, and has been the flimsy pretext for the organising of colossal Armies and Navies by England and the Continental Powers.

Neither justice nor expediency, nor the principles of international law justify the adoption of this policy for maintaining the equilibrium of Europe. All the recognized authorities of the Law of Nations condemn it :—Kluber, Heeren, Wheaton, and Ferguson in his valuable Manual of International Law, volume 1, page 180, expressly declares :—

“ That there is neither for this system of balance of power, nor for the right of intervention which it implies, any foundation in the law of nations ; ”

and in general terms he declares

“ It is prompted by selfish considerations and rapacity, from political interests sometimes called Reasons of State, put forth in support of political claims which have nothing to do with Law, and only appeal to the ‘ *droit de convenance*. ’ ”

In conclusion I cannot do better than quote the opinions of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, two of the greatest Statesmen, who have adorned by their matchless eloquence the British Parliament, and who have powerfully swayed by their teachings the Councils of the Ministers of the Crown.

Mr. Cobden, in one of his masterly articles written at the time of the Crimean War says :—

“ To secure a diminution of our Government expenditure, England must adopt a foreign policy of peaceful non-interference, instead of sallying forth in search of conquest and rapine to carry bloodshed into every quarter of the earth’s surface.

“ Had England not violated the great moral law, she would not be suffering the penalty inflicted by her own hands, crushed

beneath a debt so enormous that nothing but her own recuperative power could have borne.

“Only by renouncing that policy of intervention in the affairs of other States which has been the cause of all her wars, will England be able to avoid financial embarrassment.

“The Diplomats and Ministers of England must be restrained from taking part either by Treaties or protocols in the ever-varying quarrels of Continental Powers.”

Mr. Bright, in closing one of his powerful speeches delivered in Parliament in opposition to the Crimean War, used these memorable words :—

“The past events of our history have taught me that the intervention of this country in European Wars is not only unnecessary, but calamitous ; that we have rarely come out of such intervention having succeeded in the objects we fought for ; that a debt of £800,000,000 sterling has been incurred by the policy which the noble Lord approves,\* apparently for no other reason than that it dates from the time of William III. ; and that, not debt alone has been incurred, but that we left Europe at least as much in chains as before a single effort was made by us to rescue her from tyranny. I believe if this country, seventy years ago, had adopted the principle of non-intervention in every case where her interests were not directly and obviously assailed, that she would have been saved from much of the pauperism and brutal crimes by which our Government and people have alike been disgraced. This country might have been a garden, every dwelling might have been of marble, and every person who treads its soil might have been sufficiently educated. We should indeed have had less of military glory. We might have had neither Trafalgar nor Waterloo, but we should have set the high example of a Christian nation, free in its institutions, courteous and just in its conduct towards all Foreign States, and resting its policy on the unchangeable foundation of Christian morality.”

---

\* Lord Palmerston.







WORKS BY LEWIS APPLETON,  
AND  
Pamphlets for Politicians, Lecturers, and Essayists,  
ON  
Various Political Subjects.

---

1. **Fifty Years of Foreign Policy.** Demy 8vo. Cloth, Gilt.  
300 pages. Price 3s. 6d.

*(The above also published in a series of Eight Pamphlets):*

- i. The Wars of Queen Victoria's Reign, 1837-1887.
  - ii. Russia, Bulgaria, and Turkey, 1768-1887.
  - iii. England and Egypt, 1834-1884.
  - iv. France, China, and Tonkin.
  - v. The Neutralization of the Suez Canal.
  - vi. The Neutralization of the Panama Canal.
  - vii. Militarism in Europe, 1889.
  - viii. An International Tribunal for Europe.
2. **Henry Richard, the Apostle of Peace.** Crown 8vo.  
Boards, with Eight Portraits. 128 pages. Price 1s.
3. **Gradual Progress of International Arbitration in chronological order,** instances of its successful application, from 1794 to the present time; the Declarations of Legislative Bodies; Resolutions of Congresses; and Opinions of Statesmen and Jurists on the subject. 32 pages. Price 6d.
4. **Military and Financial Condition of Europe showing the strength of the Armies and Navies, with their annual cost; also the amount and interest of the National Debts of each Nation in Europe, 1886.** 24 pages. Price 6d.
5. **The Neutralization of the Panama Canal.** 16 pages.  
Price 6d.
6. **The Impolicy and Unwisdom of the Russo-Turkish War, of 1876-7.** 8 pages. Price 3d.
7. **A Visit to the Battle Fields around Paris, 1871.**  
12 pages. Price 3d.
8. **Reminiscences of a Visit to the Battle Fields of Sedan, Gravelotte, Spicheren, and Worth, and the Bombarded Towns of Metz, Strasburgh, Bitche, Thionville, &c., &c.** 250 pages. Price 1s.
9. **A Pamphlet containing the following Political Tracts.**  
Bound in one volume. Price 1s. :—
- i. A Comparison of Taxation between Liberal and Tory Governments.
  - ii. England's Great Interest in the choice of her New Parliament.
  - iii. Overburdened Europe, with Military and Financial Statistics.
  - iv. Five Years of Liberal Legislation—1880 to 1885.
  - v. Programme of the Liberal Party.
  - vi. Twenty Years Tory Opposition to Liberal Measures—1865 to 1885.
  - vii. A Rejoinder to the Tory Catechism on Liberal and Tory Finance.
  - viii. An Analysis of the New Parliament, 1885.

---

LONDON:

British and Foreign Arbitration Association,  
Palace Chambers, 9, Bridge Street, Westminster, S.W.